

Remarks

In the present RCE, claims 1-36 are presented for examination.

I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-8, 11-16, 19-23, 26-32, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US publication number 2004/0243616 (Benhase). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Benhase neither teaches nor suggests each element in the claims, these claims are allowable over Benhase. Some examples are provided for independent claim 1.

By way of example, claim 1 is amended to recite simultaneously displaying two different file systems in a tree hierarchy. The claim then recites “simultaneously displaying, on the table portion, the allocated storage capacity used by the storage consumers of the at least two different file systems” (emphasis added). By contrast, Benhase only displays a single kind of object in the table tree. For example, FIG. 4 of Benhase shows at table 400 for a single node LSS B: “In the present example, the storage resource by node ‘LSS B’ 412 is selected” (see Benhase at paragraph [0038]. Benhase does not show simultaneously displaying in the table portion storage capacity used by storage consumers of “at least two different file systems.” Again, Behnhase shows storage resources for a single node.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Benhase.

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 9, 10, 17, 18, 24, 25, 33, 34 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benhase in view of USPN 6,832,248 (Byrnes). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Benhase in view of Byrnes and US publication number 2005/0039123 (Kuchinsky). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Benhase in view of USPN 6,271,846 (Martinez). These rejections are traversed.

As noted in section I, Benhase does not teach or even suggest all the elements of the independent claims. Byrnes, Kuchinsky, and Martinez fail to cure these deficiencies. Thus, for at least the reasons provided with respect to the independent claims in section I, the rejected dependent claims in section II are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529